REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated December 21, 2004, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire March 21, 2005.

Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 14 to clarify
Applicant's invention. Specifically, Claim 1, as amended, now recites:

A data display system implemented by configuring generic client software to resemble a portion of a display window associated with custom client software, the data display system comprising:

a data display frame configured to display a current data record; and

a data list frame configured to display a first set of data identifiers and having a current data identifier marker for indicating a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record, wherein the data display frame and the data list frame can facilitate accessing server software over a wide area network.

Claim 14, as amended, now recites:

A method of configuring generic client software to synchronize a first frame with second frame, the method comprising:

creating a parent frame containing the first frame and the second frame, wherein the first and second frames resemble a portion of a display window created using custom client software;

storing a plurality of commands for the first frame and second frame in the parent frame;

storing a plurality of variables for the first frame and second frame in the parent frame;

displaying a first set of data identifiers in the first frame; and

placing a current data record identifier next to a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record.

As taught by Applicant in the Specification,

[0012] Many computer users require access to data records from server software 115 from different computers. For example, an employee may need to access data records from server software 115 while traveling. For example, in Fig. 1, client computer 160 may be located in a different city than server computer 110 and client computer 140. Access to server computer 110 from client computer 160 is generally limited by the bandwidth of wide area network 150. Furthermore, the specific software such as custom client software 145 may not be available on client computer 160. Therefore, server software 115 is often configured to support use of generic client software 165. In general, generic client software 165 contacts server software 115 and receives computer instructions, which configures generic client software 165 to operate with server software 115 using industry standard protocols such as HTTP and JavaScript.

[0013] However, several issues cause difficulties in replicating the features of custom client software 145 using generic client software 165. One issue is the slow speed of wide area network 150 compared to local area network 120. For example, in most implementations of custom client software 145, all the data identifiers are transmitted to custom client software 145. Thus, custom client software 145 allows a user to easily scan through portions of the data identifiers to locate a desired data record. However, the latency caused by transferring a large list of data identifiers using wide area network 150 may be unacceptable.

[0014] Another issue is due to the static nature of generic client software 165. Specifically, generic client software 165 generally requests specific data pages, such as a web page, from server software 115 using a uniform resource locater (URL). Server software 115 processes the request from generic client software 165 and sends a data page for generic client software to display. The data pages may include links (embedded URLs), which can be selected to request another data page. Thus, for example some web based email systems display a subset of the list of email message headers as links, which can be

selected to display a corresponding email message in place of the email message headers. However, conventional configurations of generic client software 165 can not replicate the dual display areas typical of custom client software 145. Hence, there is a need for a method for configuring generic client software to provide the features of custom client software using industry standard protocols.

[0015] Accordingly, generic client software, such as web browsers, is configured to allow different display frames to be synchronized in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. The synchronization provided by the present invention allows common custom client software features, such as a current data identifier marker and synchronized data list viewing to be implemented. Specifically, in one embodiment of the present invention a data display system is implemented by configuring generic client software. The data display system includes a data display frame and a data list frame. data display frame is configured to display a current data record. The data list frame is configured to display a set of data identifiers and a current data identifier marker. current data identifier marker indicates the current data identifier which corresponds to the current data record. The data display system can also include a parent frame that contains both the data display frame and the data list frame, as well as, variables and command scripts for viewing and manipulating the data records.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Murray nor Swartz, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest the recited system/method much less appreciate its advantages. Specifically, Murray teaches in col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 22:

network code (for example, in HTML or XML) corresponding to a displayable portion of network content (such as an Internet Web site) is retrieved into a users' local processing system. A list of identifiers is then stored, by specific

user choice, in the local system. Each identifier corresponds to a participating provider. In the user's local processing system, the network code is then parsed and any occurrence in the network code of any identifier stored in the list of identifiers is detected. For each detected identifier, a marker code is then inserted into the network code, the marker code indicating to the user the presence in the network code of each detected identifier. Both the network code and each inserted marker code are then displayed, whereby the presence in the network code of each detected identifier is made visible to the user.

The identifiers include network address links and text strings. The identifiers are preferably downloaded into and stored in the user's local processing system from each participating provider via a public network.

When a user is viewing network content, the invention can therefore make the user aware, for example, that a particular link or phrase on the page is associated with a participating provider, who may, for example, offer benefits such as price discounts to the user.

Figs. 1, 2, and 3 of Murray illustrates an example of how viewing of network content can generate markers. In this example, a user has joined a program whose provider has entered into contracts with several restaurant, hotel, and car rental chains such that the user can receive discounts, upgrades, etc. Col. 8, lines 46-52. After having installed into his local processing system the various software components 248, the user can load from one of the possible identifier providers 140 the list of identifiers and markers associated with the program. Col. 8, lines 53-58. Subsequently, if the user is viewing a Web site of a participating provider, then the URL of that site will match one of the stored identifiers. Col. 9, lines 15-27. At this point, a stored marker indicating the user's discount,

9

upgrade, etc. can be displayed on the HTML page. Col. 9, lines 28-32.

As shown by these passages and figures, Murray fails to disclose or suggest the recited data display frame and data list frame (Claim 1) as well as the recited first and second frames (Claim 14). Schwartz fails to remedy the deficiencies of Murray. Because neither reference, either individually or in combination, discloses or suggests the recited frames, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 14.

Claims 2-13 depend from Claim 1 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 1. Based on those reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-13.

Claims 17-25 depend from Claim 14 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 14.

Based on those reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 17-25.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-14 and 17-25 are pending in the present Application. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at 408-451-5907 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.: 022888

Jeanette S. Harms

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 35537

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April 19, 2005.

Date

S'anatura Pobaga A Paumann